

UNIVERSITY HEALTH NETWORK/ MCGILL UNIVERSITY HEALTH CENTRE HIV ADVANCED (YEAR 2) RESIDENCY PROGRAM

RESIDENCY PROJECT ASSESSMENT FORM

NAME OF RESIDENT: _____ **NAME OF PRECEPTOR:** _____

Notes:

At midpoint the resident and preceptor will complete a written self-assessment / assessment which is discussed and signed off by both the resident and preceptor. At end of year the resident and preceptor will also complete a written final self-assessment / assessment which is discussed and signed off by both the resident and preceptor. These will be reviewed by the residency coordinators in a timely fashion.

The midpoint assessment may be done at any time throughout the residency year as appropriate (e.g. after the 4th week of scheduled project time, at the 6 month point in the residency year).

ROTATION OUTCOMES:

The resident will develop the research knowledge, skills, and professional values to:

Complete a research project by the end of the residency year.

Complete a project manuscript and submit to an approved pharmacy/medical peer-reviewed journal within 3 months of the end of the residency year.

Demonstrate project management skills.

	1	2	3	4	5	NOT OBSERVED/NOT APPLICABLE
1. RESEARCH KNOWLEDGE/PROCESS						
1.1 Ethical, legal, and standards of practice knowledge (Informed consent, Research Ethics Board, Good Clinical Practice, Standard Operating Procedures)	<input type="checkbox"/> Inadequate funds of knowledge in any or all three domains to practice within appropriate perimeters at the designated level of performance.	<input type="checkbox"/> Superficial funds of knowledge in any or all three domains to practice within appropriate perimeters at the designated level of performance.	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory funds of knowledge in all three domains to practice within appropriate perimeters at the designated level of performance.	<input type="checkbox"/> Substantial funds of knowledge in all three domains to practice within appropriate perimeters at the designated level of performance.	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceptional funds in all three domains to practice consistently and perceptively ensuring best practices at the designated level of performance.	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.2 Research Ethics Board Approval process	<input type="checkbox"/> The REB application was incomplete. The resident contributed superficially to the preparation and submission of some of the required documents and/or responses to REB	<input type="checkbox"/> The REB application was incomplete. The resident contributed to the preparation and submission of some of the required documents and/or responses to REB	<input type="checkbox"/> All components of the institution(s) REB application were complete, including the application form, study protocol, recruitment/screening documents, consent form, data collection sheet, data-	<input type="checkbox"/> All components of the institution(s) REB application were complete, including the application form, study protocol, recruitment/screening documents, consent form, data collection sheet, data-	<input type="checkbox"/> All components of the institution(s) REB application were complete, including the application form, study protocol, recruitment/screening documents, consent form, data collection sheet,	<input type="checkbox"/>

	queries, often with significant assistance.	queries, often with assistance.	sharing agreement, etc. as applicable. With some assistance, the resident contributed to the preparation and submission of the required documents, and responded to the queries by the REB in a timely manner.	sharing agreement, etc. as applicable. Resident had a significant role in preparing and submitting all required documents, and responding to all queries by the REB in a timely manner.	data-sharing agreement, etc. as applicable. Resident independently prepared and submitted all required documents, and responded to all queries by the REB in a timely manner.	
Justify your rating using concrete examples:						
2. RESEARCH SKILLS						
2.1 Formulate a clear and appropriate research question using PICO format (or other suitable format)	<input type="checkbox"/> Formulated research question is unanswerable (at the designated level of performance).	<input type="checkbox"/> Formulated research question is answerable but is incomplete and missing important considerations at the designated level of performance. Requires considerable assistance.	<input type="checkbox"/> Formulated research question is answerable, relevant, and accurate, but requires assistance in developing at the designated level of performance.	<input type="checkbox"/> Formulated research question is comprehensive, relevant, and accurate and independently developed at the designated level of performance.	<input type="checkbox"/> Formulated research question is precise, perceptive, appropriately detailed, and independently developed at the designated level of performance.	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.2 Identify relevant background information for the project by performing a thorough literature search using appropriate resources.	<input type="checkbox"/> Inappropriate resources used with a poor search strategy. Significant gaps in relevant background information, with significant irrelevant information gathered.	<input type="checkbox"/> Appropriate resources used with an inefficient search strategy. Small gaps in relevant background information, with some irrelevant information gathered.	<input type="checkbox"/> Appropriate resources used with a good search strategy. No gaps in relevant background information, with very little irrelevant information gathered.	<input type="checkbox"/> Appropriate resources used with a thorough and efficient search strategy. No gaps in relevant background information, with very little irrelevant information gathered.	<input type="checkbox"/> Expertly uses resources to gather all relevant background information with an effective search strategy. No gaps in relevant background information.	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.3 Evaluate background literature in context of research question	<input type="checkbox"/> Fails to evaluate relevant from irrelevant literature; fails to compose a relevant background that justifies project at the designated level of performance.	<input type="checkbox"/> Evaluates some relevant literature, but not enough to compose a relevant background that justifies project at the designated level of performance. Requires considerable assistance.	<input type="checkbox"/> Evaluates adequate relevant literature, and is able to compose relevant background that justifies project but with assistance at the designated level of performance.	<input type="checkbox"/> Evaluates all relevant literature and is able to compose largely independently a relevant background that justifies the project very well at the designated level of performance.	<input type="checkbox"/> Precisely evaluates the relevant literature, justifies choices, synthesizes and integrates literature, and is able to compose a relevant background independently that perceptively and completely justifies project at the designated level of performance.	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.4 Select an appropriate methodology for the project, with justification.	<input type="checkbox"/> Selected a methodology that is not appropriate for the research question.	<input type="checkbox"/> Selected a methodology that is not ideal for the research question.	<input type="checkbox"/> Selected a methodology that is valid for the research question, and is able to provide some justification.	<input type="checkbox"/> Selected an ideal methodology to answer the research question, and is able to adequately justify their choice.	<input type="checkbox"/> Selected an ideal methodology to answer the research question, and is able to thoroughly justify their choice.	<input type="checkbox"/>

2.5 Determine primary and secondary outcomes.	<input type="checkbox"/> Unable to determine appropriate primary and secondary research outcomes at the designated level of performance.	<input type="checkbox"/> Determines research primary and secondary outcomes but requires extensive revisions or are missing at the designated level of performance. Requires considerable assistance.	<input type="checkbox"/> Determines most of the appropriate primary and secondary research outcomes but requires assistance at the designated level of performance.	<input type="checkbox"/> Determines complete and appropriate primary and secondary research outcomes independently at the designated level of performance.	<input type="checkbox"/> Determines all appropriate primary and secondary research outcomes and states how to collect them accurately independently at the designated level of performance.	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.6 Collect and organize relevant data for research study purposes.	<input type="checkbox"/> Fails to discern relevant from irrelevant data; Information gathered is incomplete, and/or inaccurate; important information is missing. Unable to organize or analyze data at the designated level of performance.	<input type="checkbox"/> Discerns some relevant data. Information gathered is superficial, but accurate, and/or important information is missing, and/or poorly organized and/or inappropriately analyzed at the designated level of performance. Requires considerable assistance.	<input type="checkbox"/> Discerns sufficient relevant data. Information gathered is comprehensive, relevant, and accurate, well organized, and appropriately analyzed but needs assistance at the designated level of performance.	<input type="checkbox"/> Discerns all relevant data. Information gathered is comprehensive, relevant, and accurate, well organized, appropriately analyzed independently at the designated level of performance.	<input type="checkbox"/> Precisely discerns the relevant data. Information gathered is perceptive, appropriately detailed anticipating further information collection needs, well organized, and appropriately analyzed independently at the designated level of performance.	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.7 Summarize and critically analyze the data collected, including statistical analysis.	<input type="checkbox"/> Significant data is overlooked and/or difficulty is experienced in interpreting the available data. Critical analysis is absent.	<input type="checkbox"/> Significant data may be overlooked or misinterpreted. Significant assistance is required for critical analysis of data.	<input type="checkbox"/> Most data is correctly interpreted and logically applied. Some assistance is required for critical analysis of data.	<input type="checkbox"/> All data is correctly interpreted, logically applied. Minimal to no assistance is required for critical analysis of data.	<input type="checkbox"/> Precisely and perceptively interpreting all data, strategically applying data. No assistance is required for critical analysis of data.	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.8 Arrives at appropriate interpretation and conclusion of results.	<input type="checkbox"/> Discussion and conclusion are incomplete or inappropriate; significant research results are overlooked and/or difficulty is experienced in interpreting the available research results at the designated level of performance.	<input type="checkbox"/> Discussion and conclusion are incomplete or superficial; significant data may be overlooked or misinterpreted at the designated level of performance. Requires considerable assistance.	<input type="checkbox"/> Discussion and conclusion are complete, appropriate; research results are correctly interpreted and logically applied, but assistance is needed at the designated level of performance.	<input type="checkbox"/> Discussion and conclusion are complete, appropriate; research results are correctly interpreted, logically applied, and independently determined at the designated level of performance.	<input type="checkbox"/> Discussion and conclusions are complete, appropriate, and reflect a precise and independently perceptive interpretation of all results at the designated level of performance.	<input type="checkbox"/>

Justify your rating using concrete examples:

3. COMMUNICATION, PROFESSIONAL AND INTERPERSONAL BEHAVIOURS

3.1 Communication with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants/ substitute decision makers Project team 	<input type="checkbox"/> Often incomplete, difficult to follow and/or hard to understand and/or inappropriate for the specific audience.	<input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes incomplete, superficial, rambling and not always understandable or	<input type="checkbox"/> Usually complete, adequately organized, and understandable and appropriate for the specific audience.	<input type="checkbox"/> In most cases appropriately, comprehensively and effectively focused, organized and delivered;	<input type="checkbox"/> Consistently clear and succinct, precisely focused, coherently organized and always	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	---	--	---	--	---	--------------------------

		inappropriate for the specific audience.		consistently clear and appropriate for the specific audience.	appropriate for the specific audience.	
3.2 Pharmacist/participant relationships (if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/> Lacks communication skills; does not listen to study participants; discourteous and/or inappropriate.	<input type="checkbox"/> Inconsistent communication and interpersonal skills; attention may be focused more on perceived problems than on study participants.	<input type="checkbox"/> Communicates his/her concern for the patient; establishes a rapport with the study participants.	<input type="checkbox"/> Establishes good rapport; listens actively to study participants; is sympathetic and caring.	<input type="checkbox"/> Establishes exceptional empathetic rapport; excellent listening skills; creates a caring relationship with study participants.	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.3 Interpersonal team relationships	<input type="checkbox"/> Behaviour interferes with the working of the research team; discourteous to other members of the team; undermines team; may be condescending, patronizing, passive or aggressive.	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor team player, behaviour does not facilitate the working of the research team, difficulty communicating with team members; may fail to take appropriate responsibility for own contribution to the team.	<input type="checkbox"/> Active member of the research team who works well with other members, but whose leadership skills are underdeveloped.	<input type="checkbox"/> Good, active team player who works effectively with the research team and other professionals. Developing leadership qualities.	<input type="checkbox"/> An active member of the research team whose leadership qualities are recognized by others; able to achieve best results in difficult situations without antagonizing others.	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.4 Sense of responsibility	<input type="checkbox"/> Not responsible; does less than prescribed work; needs repeated reminders.	<input type="checkbox"/> Cannot always be depended upon; needs reminders sometimes.	<input type="checkbox"/> Dependable; reliable; honest; prompt; appropriate follow-up of study patients.	<input type="checkbox"/> Takes initiative; acts independently; always completes assigned tasks; reliable and honest.	<input type="checkbox"/> Very conscientious, consistently displays exceptional attention to duties and is prepared to give extra time willingly.	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.5 Self-assessment ability (insight)	<input type="checkbox"/> Unaware of own limitations; does not seek feedback; unable to request required assistance; unable to take advice professionally.	<input type="checkbox"/> Inconsistent awareness of own limitations; some difficulty seeking feedback and taking advice professionally.	<input type="checkbox"/> Usually aware of own limitations; often seeks feedback and/or assistance to overcome deficiencies.	<input type="checkbox"/> Aware of own limitations; seeks feedback regularly and acts to improve behaviour.	<input type="checkbox"/> Well aware of own limitations; raises constructive questions; seeks feedback to excel.	<input type="checkbox"/>

Justify your rating using concrete examples:

MIDPOINT ASSESSMENT OF RESIDENT

	1	2	3	4	5	NOT OBSERVED
OVERALL						
ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE	<input type="checkbox"/> Several critical or significant gaps identified in conducting research that require development.	<input type="checkbox"/> Requires significant guidance to conduct research at the competent level. Some gaps identified that require further focused development.	<input type="checkbox"/> Competent to conduct research with some guidance.	<input type="checkbox"/> Competent to conduct research with minimal guidance.	<input type="checkbox"/> Conducts research at an expert level, with little to no guidance.	<input type="checkbox"/>

If overall performance at mid-point rated at 1 or 2, resident should develop and implement a plan to address the areas requiring improvement. Residency coordinator should be aware of and assist in development and implementation of plan, along with project preceptor. Individual areas also rated as a 1 or 2 should also have an action plan developed to address and improve these specific areas.

Resident's detailed action plan:

Resident signature:	Date:
Preceptor signature:	Date:

END OF YEAR ASSESSMENT OF RESIDENT*

Evaluation Domain	Domain Average	Weighting	Sub-Total
1: Research Knowledge	/5	X1	/5
2: Research Skills	/5	X2	/10
3: Communication/Professional/ interpersonal behaviours	/5	X1	/5
		Total:	/20

Overall Grade:

- HONOURS (Average ≥ 3.0 in each domain and total $\geq 16/20$)
- PASS (Average ≥ 3.0 in each domain and total $< 16/20$)
- FAIL (Average < 3.0 in any domain)

*Reminder: the Poster/Oral Research Presentation Assessment Form and the Scholarly Writing Assessment Form should also be completed at the end of the year/when the residency project manuscript is submitted.

Resident comments:

Preceptor comments:

Resident signature:	Date:
Preceptor signature:	Date:

Do not use or adapt assessment form without permission. Adapted with permission from St. Michael's Hospital in June 2014. Original form created by Cleo Boyd UTM Academic Skills Centre.

Last updated March 2026.